COUNCIL MEETING OF
March 28, 2006

SUPPLEMENTAL #1 TO ITEM 12A

Honorable Mayor and Members
of the Torrance City Council
City Hall
Torrance, California

Members of the Council:

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTAL #1 TO COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM 12A

The attached correspondence was received after Agenda Item 12A was prepared, and is submitted herewith for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFERY W. GIBSON
Community Development Director

By _____
TED SEMAAN
Manager, Transportation Planning, Engineering Permits and Records Division

CONCUR:

_____
Jeffery W. Gibson
Community Development Director

NOTED:

_____
LeRoy J. Jackson
City Manager

Attachment

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

12A

Crump, Jill

From: Werner, Margie
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2006 2:43 PM
To: Semaan, Ted; Crump, Jill; COUNCIL2
Subject: RV Parking Comments

For the record...Terry Schmoker (310-534-0494) and Kimberly Guiterrez (310-320-5859) will not be able to attend this evening's council meeting and phoned to let Council know that they oppose RV parking on city streets and are against "grandfathering" for even one day.

Margie Werner
Assistant to the
Mayor and City Council
City of Torrance
3031 Torrance Boulevard
Torrance, CA 90503
PH: 310-618-2801
FAX: 310-618-5841
Email Address: mwerner@torrnet.com

Crump, Jill

From: Nowatka, Paul M.
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2006 10:33 AM
To: Gin, Mike; Crump, Jill
Subject: FW: End RV on-street storage

From: CranKings@aol.com [mailto:CranKings@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 25, 2006 10:15 AM
To: Walker, Dan; Mauno, Michael H; McIntyre, Pat; Nowatka, Paul M.; Witkowsky, Hope
Subject: End RV on-street storage

I wholeheartedly agree with the rejection of the grandfathering provision. I believe the permit system is the only way to effectively control the rampant RV storage on Torrance streets by hardened scofflaws. RVs would be permitted to park on city streets only for the time periods displayed on the permit. Without permits, I believe the situation would deteriorate so that scofflaws would still be able to circumvent the intent of the law. Parking Enforcement would have to be empowered and expanded to enforce the law. As for Torrance getting involved in providing storage, us taxpayers already support Malibu waterfront, airplanes and yachts. The city should not subsidize consumer discretionary luxury items like RVs. At most, a private company should run the storage operation on land leased from the city.

Crump, Jill

From: Nowatka, Paul M.
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2006 10:26 AM
To: Gibson, Jeff; Crump, Jill
Subject: FW: Torrance parking for oversize and overweight vehicles parked on public streets
Attachments: MVC-001S.JPG; MVC-003S.JPG; MVC-008S.JPG; MVC-009S.JPG; MVC-012S.JPG

From: ohnoitzmo1@juno.com [mailto:ohnoitzmo1@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2006 1:50 PM
To: Walker, Dan; Guyton, Rod; Mauno, Michael H; McIntyre, Pat; Nowatka, Paul M.; Scotto, Frank; Witkowsky, Hope
Subject: Torrance parking for oversize and overweight vehicles parked on public streets

Dear Mayor and members of the Torrance City council,

I am writing to you to encourage you make an ordinance or ordinances that will restrict parking of oversize and overweight vehicles to comply with the existing parking ordinances that restrict any parking to 72 hours maximum for any vehicle and one (1) hour maximum for vehicles that weigh over 8000 pounds (Ref. 61.6.19). During the Feb 27, 2006 council meeting it was stated by the police department and legal department that these ordinances are not being enforced by issuance of citations. The police representative at the meeting alluded to some legal decision during 2005 that restricted issuing citations because of lack of certain signage at the entrances to the city. Action(s) must be taken by the city to be able to enforce these ordinances by issuance of citations. If action is not taken to correct you might find 18 wheelers parked in front of your residences and the police could not issue citations.

There are numous instances where people that own large RV's are using the city streets for storage.

Fonthill Ave north of Maricopa adjacent to the high density residential development of the old Magnavox property has 3 or 4 RV's parked there because there is no RV parking in the project. This situation must be corrected and as far as I can tell there was no provision for this parking made in the ordinance proposal.

Alaska street near Myers RV is inundated with large RV storage on the street. Columbia Street west of Alaska has numerous large RV's stored there on a regular basis.

Abalone Street south of Carson street has numerous large RV's stored in the center of the street and along the curbs.

There are areas where there are extra wide vehicles are parked so that one set of wheels is over the curb and on the parkway and cones are placed in the street next to them. These are very narrow streets.

Try Juno Platinum for Free! Then, only $9.95/month!
Unlimited Internet Access with 1GB of Email Storage.
Visit http://www.juno.com/value to sign up today!

Crump, Jill

From: Nowatka, Paul M.
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2006 10:12 AM
To: Gibson, Jeff; Crump, Jill
Subject: FW: DRAFT- RV letter

From: Jim Dilamarter [mailto:jld.dilassoc@adelphia.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2006 12:01 PM
To: pmnowatka@torrnet.com
Subject: DRAFT- RV letter

Parnelli Jones
20501 Earl St. Suite 2
Torrance, CA 90503

March 21, 2006

Councilman Paul Nowatka
City of Torrance

Dear Mr. Nowatka,

I would like to add my thoughts and opinion to the RV street parking vote which will affect in various ways, many residents and all property owners of Torrance. As a long time Torrance property owner myself, I am very concerned that RV parking may be allowed to continue on city streets and driveways in the almost unabated fashion as it is presently.

Let me make it clear however, that I do not oppose the needs of a RV, boating or motorcycle enthusiast who require a reasonable amount of time to load or unload a RV or a trailer in the street or driveway. What I am adamantly opposed to are those who flagrantly flaunt the spirit of the law just by moving their parked RV's or trailers, a few inches every 72 hours or worse, move their RV's onto someone else's street for the next 72 hours. I personally know of a van, filled with junk, which has been parked continuously on Earl St. for over FOUR years in the same spot, give or take an inch or two! Further, the owner does not even live on this street.
I also have a problem with RV's that are stored in driveways for extensive periods and never seem to move from that spot except for a week or two during the year.

Owners of street parked RV's, some who aren't even residents of Torrance, are blatantly using our city streets as a storage yard, essentially abusing and beating the system. More importantly however, as has been pointed out on previous occasions by others, among other problems these vehicles cause, is a dangerous situation for children at play and, for drivers attempting to exit driveways, or view approaching traffic at intersections because their view is sometimes blocked by RV's that are inappropriately parked by their inconsiderate owners.

For me it is also about respect; respect for the spirit of the law, respect for the City, respect for your neighbors and the neighborhood. Which is another reason that RV's just don't belong parked on city streets, driveways or front yards, and that is because as most realtors will tell you, their presence

devalues that area's property and creates the potential for deterioration of the city's stature in the region. In my opinion, if someone can afford to purchase an RV, put gas in it, and maintain it, they certainly could, or should be able to store it at proper RV storage yard. Of course then we hear the RV owners complain that it's inconvenient or expensive for them. I say what about the inconvenience to others that have to put up these unsightly houses on wheels parked in the street or in a neighbor's front yard for what seems to be endless periods of time.

I would like to thank you for taking a moment to read my message and for your serious consideration to this matter which, as I stated earlier affects each and every property owner in the City of Torrance.

I urge you to adopt a law which will eliminate the parking of any RV or trailer on a city street, driveway or front yard except for a reasonable period to load and unload, and that you DO NOT insert a grandfather clause of any description.

Sincerely,

Parnelli Jones

Crump, Jill

From: Joy Peeraer [j_peeraer6@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 1:43 PM
To: Jim Harrigan
Cc: r guyton; mh mauno; p mcintyre; pm nowatka; f scotto; cd traffic; d walker; h witkowsky
Subject: Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"

Dear Mr. Harrigan:

I'm sorry that you see this as a "game." Should you truly see it that way, please, for the sake of all concerned, keep this civil and legal.

Yours cordially

Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

Jim Harrigan <jh@econdevsys.com> wrote:

> Game on
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Joy Peeraer <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>
> **Date:** Fri, 24 Mar 2006 11:34:25 -0800 (PST)
> **To:** Jim Harrigan <jh@econdevsys.com>
> **Cc:** r guyton <rguyton@torrnet.com>, mh mauno <mhmauno@torrnet.com>, p mcintyre <pmcintyre@torrnet.com>, pm nowatka <pmnowatka@torrnet.com>, f scotto <fscotto@torrnet.com>, cd traffic <cddtraffic@torrnet.com>, d walker <dwalker@torrnet.com>, h witkowsky <hwitkowsky@torrnet.com>
> **Subject:** Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"
>
> Dear Mr. Harrigan:
>
> Yes, we have given it thought. We have put it in our driveway to please the neighbors too, damaging the new $13,000 driveway I might add. That wasn't enough. We also offered to move it to a storage facility if the neighbors wanted to collectively pay the monthly fee.
>
> However, due to the amount of use our RV gets because of our daughters' racing schedule, just about every weekend, we have changed our opinion on that matter and we feel it is our right to store it on front of our home. Period.
>
> Again, we wish no ill feelings and wish a peaceful resolution of this matter. However, as I stated before, we will not be bullied by you or anyone else.
>
> We will fight to oppose your efforts to the very last hour.
>
> Please be advised that this and all further communications, in the form of emails or memoranda, will be copied directly the Mayor Dan Walker and the Councilmembers.
>
> Kindest personal regards,
>
> Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

Jim Harrigan <jh@econdevsys.com> wrote:

Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"
It's interesting to note that you've "only" stored your RV in front of your house for the last 10 months. Have you ever given consideration to storing it in a storage yard...out of a residential neighborhood?

From: Joy Peeraer <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 24 Mar 2006 09:52:53 -0800 (PST)
To: Jim Harrigan <jh@econdevsys.com>
Cc: r guyton <rguyton@torrnet.com>, mh mauno <mhmauno@torrnet.com>, p mcintyre <pmcintyre@torrnet.com>, pm nowatka <pmnowatka@torrnet.com>, f scotto <fscotto@torrnet.com>, cd traffic <cddtraffic@torrnet.com>, d walker <dwalker@torrnet.com>, h witkowsky <hwitkowsky@torrnet.com>
Subject: Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"

Dear Mr. Harrigan:

Please note that we purchased our 2006 RV in June of 2005, therefore we have only stored it in front of our home for approximately 9 months. DMV records can prove that.

Where you get "the last three years" is just further evidence of your ignorance of this situation and the author's willingness to blatantly lie to the neighbors AND the City in the many attempts for personal gain. How boorish is that?

Furthermore, by and through the author's public memos to all of our neighbors and your email correspondence with me, you attempt to defame our family and the author is requesting that other neighbors engage in your campaign of harassment against us, the City and especially against Mayor Dan Walker himself by requesting that they call him "immediately and often." Squeaky wheels may be heard, it is true. Bullies are seen as just that.

Please refrain from this harassment or I will seek legal counsel to take all appropriate remedies against you, the author of the memos, and your association until the decision on this matter is made. At which time, I will lawfully abide by the City's decision, whatever that may be.

I am forwarding a copy of this email to Honorable Dan Walker and the Councilmembers so that they can witness first hand your unprofessional and inappropriate conduct regarding this issue.

You may wish to re-think who is truly being boorish in this situation. Our family is merely exercising our right to be heard regarding our views on the matter. If this is considered boorish, then perhaps you and your association may wish to lobby our lawmakers to completely re-write the Constitution.

Best personal regards to you, your family and the association.
It is our wish for a peaceful resolution of this matter.

Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

Jim Harrigan <jh@econdevsys.com> wrote:

Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"
Thank you for your explanation for the reasons on why you've stored your trailer in front of your house for the last three years. You've proved the El Sereno letter writer right. You truly come off as a selfish boor that is only thinking of yourself. Congratulations.

Jim Harrigan

Hillside Residents Association

From: Joy Peeraer <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>
Date: Thu, 23 Mar 2006 20:34:16 -0800 (PST)
To: jh@econdevsys.com
Cc: r guyton <rguyton@torrnet.com>, mh mauno <mhmauno@torrnet.com>, p mcintyre <pmcintyre@torrnet.com>, pm nowatka <pmnowatka@torrnet.com>, f scotto <fscotto@torrnet.com>, cd traffic <cddtraffic@torrnet.com>, d walker <dwalker@torrnet.com>, h witkowsky <hwitkowsky@torrnet.com>
Subject: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"

Hillside Residents Association (HRA)

To Whom it May Concern:

I am in receipt of a memorandum dated March 15, 2006 which is entitled as referenced above. However, I was not the intended recipient as I reside at 4814 Via El Sereno, the property address at issue with regard to the ownership and storage of our RV in our driveway or on the street in front of our home.

I promptly took it upon myself to respond to this anger driven memo directly to The Honorable Dan Walker and His Councilmembers. A copy of which you may have the opportunity to review at some point in the future.

I find it very comedic that you repeatedly refer to Via El Sereno as "[Your] Steet" considering that: 1) Our particular home was originally purchased by the Sawers Family and is still owned by the Sawers Family, Second and Third Generations. Needless to say, we will NEVER sell so it is indeed OUR street too; 2) A large number of you who claim that the ownership and storage of our RV affects your property values are merely newcomers, as compared to the 45+ years that this home has been in our family; and lastly; 3) Many of the homeowners on the "lower end" of Via El Sereno only have the luxury of even owning a home there because of the self-less original homeowners who signed an agreement in support of/not opposing their construction tens of years ago. Sad thing is, you would not find that type of human regard now. Not here. Not on this street.

I am not going to trouble myself with writing a lengthy memo as to why I feel the memo secretly sent to every homeowner on Via El Sereno, except us, should be brought to the attention of the appropriate persons.

What I will say is that we feel that it is our legal right to store our RV on our property, be it in the driveway or on the street in front of our property.

Our right should not be taken away because of the current property values, realizing that the alleged safety issue is clearly a mute point. The fact that the type of people, who purchase homes at the current prices, do not live outside the box, cannot fairly dictate law.

That having been said, we will vehemently oppose your efforts to take away said right.

Cordially,
Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

Blab-away for as little as 1¢/min. Make PC-to-Phone Calls
<http://us.rd.yahoo.com/mail_us/taglines/postman2/*http://us.rd.yahoo.com/evt=39663/*http://voice
using Yahoo! Messenger with Voice.

New Yahoo! Messenger with Voice. Call regular phones from your PC
<http://us.rd.yahoo.com/mail_us/taglines/postman5/*http://us.rd.yahoo.com/evt=39666/*http://beta.messe
>
<http://us.rd.yahoo.com/mail_us/taglines/postman5/*http://us.rd.yahoo.com/evt=39666/*http://beta.messe
20> and save big.

New Yahoo! Messenger with Voice. Call regular phones from your PC
<http://us.rd.yahoo.com/mail_us/taglines/postman5/*http://us.rd.yahoo.com/evt=39666/*http://beta.messenger.y
> and save big.

Yahoo! Messenger with Voice. PC-to-Phone calls for ridiculously low rates.

Crump, Jill

From: Nowatka, Paul M.
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 3:55 PM
To: Gibson, Jeff; Crump, Jill
Subject: FW: RV Parking

-----Original Message-----
From: Helene Babbitt [mailto:hbabbitt@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 12:48 PM
To: Walker, Dan; Mauno, Michael H; McIntyre, Pat; Nowatka, Paul M.; Witkowsky, Hope
Subject: RV Parking

Re: RV parking in Torrance.

RV parking on Torrance streets is unattractive, People have the right to own and enjoy RV's but should be responsible for there storage, It is unfair to ask Torrance taxpayers to foot the bill for RV facilities.

Please consider the large precent of Torrance homeowners who do not own R V's and prefer not to have
to look at them on a daily basis.

Helene Babbitt
5335 Sharynne Lane
Torrance 90505
hbabbitt@sbcglobal.net

Crump, Jill

From: Nowatka, Paul M.
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 4:21 PM
To: Gibson, Jeff; Crump, Jill
Subject: FW: RV parking

From: sandy sternquist [mailto:sandynmonte@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2006 8:38 PM
To: Guyton, Rod; Mauno, Michael H; McIntyre, Pat; Nowatka, Paul M.; Scotto, Frank; Walker, Dan; Witkowsky, Hope
Cc: Semaan, Ted
Subject: RV parking

When reading the notes from the Feb. 28th meeting I noticed several things of interest. First of all there are seven (7) pages of "other town" actions regarding parking however when I called Redondo, Carson, Lomita and Lawndale (our neighboring towns) they all said "72 hr. parking, same as any other motor vehicle". Also the list of City Wide Survey of RV's and other oversized vehicles listed a lot of trailers, boats, and other non-motorized vehicles as well as pages of out- of- town vehicles parked, many of which show 'no record' of ownership. If these violations were cleared up there would be a lot less RV's on the streets.

I still strongly believe current home/RV owners should be 'grandfathered' in as all of us bought our RV's before restrictions were even considered. The term 'affordable' with respect to RV storage is a relative term and cannot be assumed that all RV owners can afford this. We have owned an RV for 32 years and to change rules on us, and others, is truly unfair. I doubt if most complainers have lived in Torrance that long so why move in and want things changed.

We noticed at the council meeting 2-28-06 that the people who are in favor of restricting RV parking are on the agressive side of this argument and the RV owners are the victims of this agression. We, the RV owners, are not trying to change anything and want parking to reman the same as its always been.

In closing please just consider inforcing the current laws on the books and not add additional laws. Our Police Dept. has enough to do without issuing special permits and etc to we RV, and in most cases homeowners, of Torrance.

Thanks to the traffic commission for the time and effort they put into this project to make it come out fair. We will all be at the council meeting Tues, March 28th to see how you vote on this issue.

Crump, Jill

From: Nowatka, Paul M.
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 3:54 PM
To: Gibson, Jeff; Crump, Jill
Subject: FW: RV & oversize vehicle parking

-----Original Message-----
From: tom [mailto:tom_elkins@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 11:17 AM
To: crankings@aol.com; Guyton, Rod; Mauno, Michael H; McIntyre, Pat; Nowatka, Paul M.; Scotto, Frank; Witkowsky, Hope
Subject: RV & oversize vehicle parking

2nd thoughts on RV & oversize vehicle parking

In my opinion the GRANDFATHERING of RV & OVERSIZE VEHICLES does not solve the problem, it just leaves use at status quo.

I believe the original idea was to eventually get rid of all RV & OVERSIZE VEHCILES parked on Torrance Streets.

If we just have an ordinance that stops all RV & OVERSIZE VEHICLE parking on Torrance streets that also solves the problem of other cities dumping there RV & OVERSIZE VEHICLES on Torrance Streets (30% of RV & OVERSIZE VEHICLES on Torrance Streets not owned by Torrance residence). It would also solve the problem of gated communites that do not allow parking of RV &
OVERSIZE VEHICLES inside of their gates. Three (3)
problems solved with one ordinance.

I believe 6 mo to 1 year for the present owners of RV & OVERSIZE VEHICLES to find other parking places would be sufficent.

thanks
tom_elkins@yahoo.com

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around http://mail.yahoo.com

Crump, Jill

From: Joy Peeraer [j_peeraer6@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 10:29 AM
To: r guyton; mh mauno; p mcintyre; pm nowatka; f scotto; cd traffic; d walker; h witkowsky
Subject: 4814 Via El Sereno, RV Issue

Dear Honorable Dan Walker and Councilmembers:

First of all, I wanted to apologize for the numerous emails being sent your way in a suddent gust. It is not my intent to cause any unrest but I do feel that I have the right to defend my family in this battle.

As a sidenote, I wanted to say that my family uses our RV almost every weekend. My entire family, including our 4 daughters, race their quads in the desert or just trail ride for fun. We try to teach them a true appreciation for the outdoors, from the desert to the ocean, because we are also avid surfers. These daughters are going to be s in this community and is our goal to ensure that they become upstanding happy citizens, as free as possible from the poison of our morally deteriorating society and as free as possible from the negative effects of , alcohol and bad associations. My 9 year-old daughter Katherine just won her first motocross trophy last week which was a very big self-esteem booster. A happy occasion that would not be possible without the regular use of our RV.

If we are forced to keep our RV elsewhere, it will be virtually impossible for me to prepare our family for these trips every Friday afternoon, as well as unloading on Monday and doing the necessary chores to ensure for a smooth next trip.

Morever, I suffer from Lupus which is difficult to manage in and of itself. The stress that this war is causing me and my family is only further exacerbating my health issues. The harassment we are enduring, i.e. being targeted and called names, etc., is simply unjust.

So, again, I apologize for creating another lengthy memo, I just wanted to let you know that we use our RV a lot, not just once a year or once in a while. We need the ability to have it in front of our home.

Thank you for your audience in this regard. I appreciate your time and consideration. Best wishes for a relaxing weekend.

Kind regards,

Joy M. Peeraer
4814 Via El Sereno,

Blab-away for as little as 1¢/min. Make PC-to-Phone Calls using Yahoo! Messenger with Voice.

Crump, Jill

From: Joy Peeraer [j_peeraer6@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 6:43 AM
To: jh@econdevsys.com
Cc: r guyton; mh mauno; p mcintyre; pm nowatka; f scotto; cd traffic; d walker; h witkowsky
Subject: Correction to prior email: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street

Hillside Residents Association (HRA)

As I reviewed my email to you regarding the above, it occurred to me that I used the word "mute" incorrectly...I got a chuckle when I re-read it as silly as the mistake is.

Anyway, the word "moot" was intended as it relates to alleged safety issues concerning our RV. The street on which we live is a wide street with ample visibility, not the narrow streets of Old Torrance or the like. There is minimal traffic as it is a partial cul de saq and most obey the speed laws. Our RV does not cause any visual disturbances affecting the safety of our children. Period. Any visual disturbance caused by our RV is only a matter of personal taste of a very loud few.

Furthermore, the safety issues as they relate to this neighborhood are merely used as fuel for the fire, given that there are no safety issues even referenced in your most recent memo.

I apologize for any misunderstanding this slight typographical error may have caused, but I'm sure you understood the intended point upon reading it. It was late and I was very tired, especially tired of having to defend what I feel is our legal right.

Lastly, we do not take kindly to your bullying tactics, i.e. your request stated in your memo that all neighbors harass us every three days through complaints to the City, nor do we receive well the use of degrading words, i.e. "boorish neighbors," etc. To your discredit, it only brings to light the true underlying basis for your argument, which I'm absolutely sure Honorable Dan Walker and his Councilmembers will take into consideration being the fair leaders that they are.

Very truly yours,
Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

Blab-away for as little as 1¢/min. Make PC-to-Phone Calls using Yahoo! Messenger with Voice.

Crump, Jill

From: Joy Peeraer [j_peeraer6@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 5:27 PM
To: dwalker@torrnet.com
Cc: r guyton; mh mauno; p mcintyre; pm nowatka; f scotto; cd traffic; h witkowsky
Subject: Letter dated March 15, 2006 Regarding "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on Our Street"
Attachments: 405538283-scan0001.jpg

To The Honorable Mayor Dan Walker and Councilmembers:

As resident and family member of the owner of **4814 Via El Sereno**, the property being attacked for the ownership and storage of a Recreational Vehicle, I am writing on behalf of our family and perhaps the families of other RV owners to address my concerns regarding a memo which was graciously provided to us by one of the neighbors on our street who emphathizes with us regarding the vicious battle which we currently face. Not all of the residents on our street have such aggressive views regarding this issue. As a matter of fact, they are only a very loud few. **(Attached hereto is a copy of the above-referenced memorandum dated March 15, 2006.)**

That having been said, I will respond to the memo by paragraph so as to facilitate the true undertanding of each issue:

See Memo, Paragraph 3: The memo states concerns regarding property values and the recent sale of 4816 Via El Sereno, however, the memo conveniently omits a very important detail, the **reason** why the home was put on the market in the first place.

The owners at 4806 Via El Sereno have spoken with us at length regarding the sale of their home and have indicated that among the many reasons for the sale of their home, one of them is NOT our family...**(NOT OUR RV, NOR OUR ATV's)** nor our "trendy" lifestyle but rather the hostility and animosity which they have been the victims of by a select few neighbors who have made it their job in life to try to inappropriately micro-manage the neighborhood. The same leaders of this war against us.

They indicated that they were concerned for the future of their daughters in a neighborhood lacking neighborly love. These owners were even the victims of a vandalous act wherein the children of one of the militant neighbors placed offensive material on their front doorstep and, when questioned, **tried to blame the incident on OUR CHILDREN** since (given the size and circumstances of our family) they would seem the most likely suspects, only later to find out the actual truth of the matter.

They further indicated that they would write a letter on our behalf and expressed only their utmost support for our RVing/ATVing lifestyle.

Furthermore, the **5** (NOT 6) All Terrain Vehicles, each owned outright by the owner of 4814 Via El Sereno and cumulatively valued in excess of at $40,000, are **NOT stored..."in [our] front yard"** but rather **ARE IN FACT STORED INSIDE THE RV** or our **GARAGE**. This statement, as well as others, is a blatantly untrue and self-serving statement made with injurious intent. There is nothing in or around our property which would be considered in violation of ANY Torrance City Code.

See Memo, Paragraph 5: "We feel that this is a residential neighborhood and all RVs and **commercial trucks** (with the exception of pick-ups) should be parked in an appropriate industrial storage facility, out of sight to neighbors..." (Emphasis added.)

This raises a very good question as to the many LARGE trucks and extra vehicles regularly parked in the residents' driveways and on our street for days and weeks at a time while they are doing home improvements, i.e. new roofs, tree trimming, interior reconstruction or refuse disposal. Again, this paragraph is worded in a self-serving manner because every one of us has had home improvement done, some of us recently, thereby causing visibility of large "commercial trucks" or refuse bins for several days at a time in excess of 3 days.

Also, let me mention that one of the neighbors who recently spoke at the last City Council meeting (aggressively against parking our RV in front of our home) actually had an out of town family member with an RV parked in front of their home (jutting into the cul de saq, and perpendicular to the street I might add) for I believe an excess of 3 days, causing a similar eyesore, the same eyesore we are being accused of.

See Memo Paragraph 6: "As we are tired of playing games, we now request that all residents call the City Parking [E]nforcement" at 310-618-2344 every 3 days..."

We too are tired of playing games. By this statement, the author of this memo is making an attempt to rally homeowners to harass us pending the outcome of the City's decision...."to call and keep calling..." "Squeaky wheels that vote are noticed by all politicians. Please discipline yourself to call these two numbers IMMEDIATELY AND OFTEN." (Emphasis added.)

It is incomprehensible how you, Honorable Dan Walker, as ultimately fair as you are and it appears a very kind man indeed, could find this persistent harassment of the privileged minority anything but just that. This is a war between Daniel and Goliath and we are being unfairly bullied pending this decision. It is the responsibility of the City to cite us as necessary, not this group of militant homeowners.

See Memo Paragraph 7: "these boorish neighbors..." "trendy selfishness because they can afford it." This is character degradation at its best. By the use of these words, the basis for their argument has undertones of a very personal nature which should NOT be the basis for any legal decisions made regarding this issue. Furthermore, we take great offense to these words as they, by definition, attempt to suggest perhaps a lower level of civil refinement because of our lifestyle.

"Thank you for keeping our neighborhood clean, attractive and expensive."
I am appalled at the arrogance of this sentence. This neighborhood wasn"t always known for its "expensive" qualities but rather a beautiful community in which a family could be raised happily. AN RV FOSTERS FAMILY UNITY. Why should the people with families who still live here (and have lived here since the home was built over 45 years ago) be bullied by newcomers or those with moral characters reflective of a community of exorbitant property values and money arrogance. Hardly fair. Highly discriminatory.

I respectfully request that this issue be treated with the utmost of fairness to **all** concerned, not just the very vocal and aggressively harrassing anti-RV homeowners.

Kind personal regards,

Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

Blab-away for as little as 1¢/min. Make PC-to-Phone Calls using Yahoo! Messenger with Voice.

From: kk
To: Ted Semaan and Traffic Commissioners
Sent: Tuesday, 14 June, 2005 07:28
Subject: Proposed Ordinance: On Street Parking of Certain Vehicles

First, may I extend my appreciation and understanding of the time/energy/effort expended by you, your staff, and the Traffic Commissioners, with respect to this subject. With the framework/ground rules you were originally given, to draft the proposed ordinance, the NO VOTE shows that the welfare of all sides of the issue are being taken into consideration.

Please forward this email to the Traffic Commissioners, in time for due consideration at the sub-committee meeting being held about the 18th. of July. Will this meeting be an open meeting? If yes, would appreciate notice of the time and place of this meeting. Also, request to have my name included on your list of parties to be notified of upcoming meetings regarding this important matter.

Another prescription, along with the enforcement of the 72 hour parking rule, would be to utilize other Municipal Codes currently "on the books". May I place the following for serious consideration:

- DIVISION 4 - PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE: ARTICLE 5 - REMOVAL OF ABANDONED, WRECKED, DISMANTLED, OR INOPERATIVE VEHICLES OR PARTS THEREOF ON PUBLIC OR PRIVATE PROPERTY
- DIVISION 6 - TRAFFIC CHAPTER 1 - TRAFFIC SECTION 61.6.10 PARKING ON NARROW STREETS. (Amended by O-1618)
  a) The City Traffic Engineer is hereby authorized to place signs or markings indicating no parking upon any street when the width of the roadway is less than twenty-seven (27) feet, or upon one side of a street as indicated by such signs or markings when the width of the roadway is less than thirty-four (34) feet.
- SECTION 61.6.11. PARKING PROHIBITED IN SPECIFIED PLACES WHEN SIGNS, ETC. ERECTED.
  The City Traffic Engineer shall appropriately sign or mark the following places and where so signed or marked no person shall stop, stand or park a vehicle.
  a) At any place within twenty (20) feet of a point on the curb immediately opposite the mid-block end of a crosswalk.
  b) At any place within twenty-five (25) feet of an intersection in any business district except that a bus may stop at a designated bus stop.
  c) Within twenty-five (25) feet of the approach to any traffic signal, boulevard stop sign, or official stop or flashing device.
  d) At any place where the City Traffic Engineer determines that it is necessary to avoid an hazardous or unusual traffic hazard.
- SECTION 61.6.31. REGULATING VEHICLE HABITATION ON PUBLIC STREETS.(Added by O-3146)
  No person shall use any vehicle parked or standing upon any public street, alley, right of way, public park or other public property for the purpose of living, sleeping, cooking, bathing or housekeeping; provided however that no person shall be found in violation of this section who sleeps in a vehicle in an emergency for a period of time not to exceed twelve (12) hours in any thirty (30) day period where parking is not otherwise prohibited.
- SECTION 61.6.32. RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING. (Added by O-3120. Amended by O-3130, O-3562, O-3663) Residential permit parking districts are hereby established within the City .... The vehicles displaying a sign, sticker or other identification that has been issued by the City of Torrance will not be construed to be a permit of or approval of, any violation of any other provisions of this Code or any other law or regulation. (note: verbiage of current Code would have to be amended to include other streets, as set by proposed ordinance, on streets other than already included in the Section ...)

Respectfully,
karen k. fitch 48 year resident
2414 - 236th. street 42 year homeowner
torrance, ca 90501 low income senior citizen/RV owner

Received/Made Part of the Record
City Council
Date 3/28/06 Item No. 12A

A Friendly Sign

We're seeing RV FRIENDLY on more and more highway signs, which makes our life much easier. **By Sue Bray**

HOW MANY TIMES have you found yourself trying to navigate a big motorhome or tow a large trailer into a parking lot or gas station, only to find that you have no business being there at all? There's simply no room for your RV.

Even if you arrive at a destination where you do fit, there's often that uncertainty as you pull in: Am I going to be able to make that turn? Is that overhang high enough so that I don't scrape my air conditioner? Will I find a place big enough to park? Am I going to wind up having to back out of a small space or, worse yet, have to disconnect my tow car?

I probably shouldn't tell stories, but I remember driving a mini motorhome through central California with just my two children who were ages 4 and 1. We'd had a bad morning, and after several hours of crying and whining, the baby had finally fallen asleep in her car seat. Of course, by this point my son was hungry and I was afraid to stop the engine and wake up his sister to go inside a restaurant. But I had a solution: The friendly arches of a fast-food restaurant were in sight.

We headed for the drive-through, ordered our hamburgers . . . and wound up taking a small part of the restaurant's overhang with us, attached to the air conditioner.

In some states, help is on the way. In 2003, Oregon became the Federal Highway Administration's model state to test a program where RV Friendly markers were added to highway exit signs (also known as GAS/FOOD/LODGING signs) for businesses that cater to the needs of people driving an RV. Since then, state legislations in Michigan, Tennessee, Washington, Louisiana, Texas and Florida have passed laws incorporating the RV Friendly markers on their highway signs, and legislation is currently pending in Mississippi and Alabama.

The states are able to design their own RV Friendly logo, but it's usually a small yellow circle with the letters RV and a big smile.

Standards for all the RV Friendly highway-sign legislation passed so far were established by the Oregon Travel Information Council. They are:

1. Roadway access and egress must be hard surface, free of potholes and be at least 12 feet wide with a minimum swing radius of 50 feet to enter and exit the facility.
2. Roadway access, egress and parking facilities must be free of any electrical wires, tree branches or other obstructions up to 14 feet above the surface.
3. Facilities requiring short-term parking — restaurants, tourist attractions, etc. — are required to have two or more spaces that are 12 feet wide and 65 feet long with a swing radius of 50 feet to enter and exit the spaces.
4. Fueling facilities with canopies are required to have a 14-foot clearance and those selling diesel fuel are required to have pumps with non-commercial nozzles.
5. Fueling facilities must allow for pull through with a swing radius of 50 feet.
6. For campgrounds, two or more spaces that are 18-by-45 feet are required.

Not only does the RV Friendly designation make it easier for us as we drive the highways, it benefits local communities and states.

In the summer of 2004, RVers spent an estimated $3.8 billion in local communities throughout the United States. Not only does the RV Friendly designation make it easier for us as we drive the highways, it also benefits local communities and states. We're much more likely to stop if we see the designation, rather than bypassing local businesses because we are uncertain that we can be accommodated.

It's anticipated that another five to 10 states will adopt the RV Friendly legislation this year, and we, the RVing public, can help it become more widespread. If you live in a state where it has not been considered, contact your state legislator and tell him or her about it. If you don't know the name of your legislator, or if you want more information about this issue, visit www.goodsamclub.com/rvact. Click on "State Officials" and enter your zip code.

This is our opportunity to make our states more RV friendly.

Sue Bray is the Executive Director of the Good Sam Club.

Received/Made Part of the Minutes
City Council
3/28/06 Item 12A

March 28, 2006

Honorable Mayor and City Council

It is obvious to all of us there are RV and oversize vehicle parking problems in our city.

The solutions range from banning them altogether to doing nothing at all: either of which is unacceptable. We need to find some middle ground.

The proposed ordinance comes too close to first extreme as it effectively bans parking except for loading and unloading, and that by temporary permit only. This is clearly overkill and is not acceptable to most RV owners. The ordinance also limits the owner's ability to service their vehicles on the street.

There are several actions short of the proposed ban which can greatly reduce the RV parking problem. I propose a 4 point alternate plan.

FIRST Permits and Parking Limits

I would register and issue parking stickers to all resident RV owners: who would continue to be governed by the 72hr rule. All other RVs would be limited to 6 hour parking unless issued a temporary permit.
This does 4 important things.

Received/Made Part of the Record
City Council
3/28/06 Item No. 12A

1. **It gets non-resident RVs stored on our streets off our streets.**
2. **It does not burden the resident RV owner with the requirement to get a temporary permit every time he wants to put his vehicle on the street. A saving to the city also.**
3. **It recognizes the needs of tourist and visitor RVs passing through or visiting our city to stop for supplies and services, visit attractions, etc.**
4. **It provides an opportunity for city parking enforcement to educate RV owners. A flier could be handed out at the time of RV registration summarizing all applicable parking regulations.**

SECOND **Restrict RV Parking**

1. **Near boulevard stops, intersections, school crossings and commercial driveways.**
2. **Narrow streets where 2-way traffic is allowed unless all parking is banned on one side of the street.**
3. **Roads where unique safety hazards would result.**
4. **Additional parking restrictions should be considered for some vehicles that are not self-propelled such as boat trailers.**

THIRD **72 Hour Code Enforcement**

The Police need new tools to make enforcement of the 72 hour code eaiser, especially where neighborhood conflicts exist. In addition to citations and towing the police should have the option to revoke a resident parking permit based on written complaint of three or more immediate neighbors who allege violation of the code.

This will provide a process for preventing the offender from continuing to store his vehicle in the neighborhood, and put him in the same position as a visitor to our city. The 6 hour limit would apply unless a temporary permit is issued for loading and unloading.

Except for acting on the neighbor complaints or important safety issues the city should suspend any enforcement of the 72 hour code until sufficient off street parking can be arranged.

FOURTH **Off-Street Parking**

The Community Development Department should be mandated to find suitable low cost off-street facilities for those RVs displaced from our streets by strict enforcement of the 72 hour code.

The lack of effective enforcement of the code has made the city largely responsible for the RV parking problem,

and this should obligate the city to actively participate in providing off-street parking somewhere in the city.

Capital outlays and operating subsidies are justifiable. After all, the many parks and other city recreation facilities were bought by the city, and their operation/maintenance is paid with taxpayer funds. RV owners provide a small but important recreational resourse for many residents without using taxpayer funds. In fact they pay way more taxes for the privilege of using our streets than most other vehicle owners.

CONUCLUSION

In conclusion I recommend the city council take two actions tonight.

First The first is to send the proposed ordinance back to Community Development for simplification and consideration of the ideas and concerns expressed now and previously.

The department should be instructed to appoint a volunteer working group (think-tank group) to assist in this task. The group should consist of at least eight citizens but not more than 12.

RV owners and non-owners must be equally represented. The group must also include a representative of Traffic Enforcement and a couple Community Development staffers. A City Council

member such as Rod Guyton should be considered for the working group. And I want to be the first volunteer for it.

After the working group has finished revising the proposed ordinance it should be presented to one more public hearing before being finalized and sent back to City Council for action.

The parking problem has been festering for years, so spending a few more months to achieve an acceptable solution is justified. Let's spend the time and effort to get it right the first time.

Second My second recommendation is to task the Community Development Department to define and implement a plan for providing sufficient low cost off-street parking to accommodate those RVs forced off our streets by the ordinance and strict enforcement of the 72 hour code. Where these parking facilities are located in the city and who operates them are secondary as long as the job gets done in a timely manner.

If the council follows my two recommendations I think we can come up with an acceptable solution which will not put too much hardship on anyone.

This concludes my comments unless the council has some questions. Thank you for listening.

J. Edward Bower 310-325-7693

City of Torrance
City Council Meeting
March 28, 2006

Submission by Joy M. Peeraer,
Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno, Torrance 90505

In Support of the Homeowners' Legal Right
to Park Lawfully Owned and Registered Operable
Recreational Vehicles
in Their Driveways or Streets Near Their Homes

Received/Made Part of the Record
City Council Meeting
3/28/06 Item No. 12A

To Honorable Dan Walker, the Councilmembers and All Concerned (Collectively referred to as "The City of Torrance")

I reside at 4814 Via El Sereno, Torrance, 90505, and appreciate the opportunity to address the City of Torrance regarding the issue of RV use and storage.

*****

First, I'd like to read to you an excerpt from a statement issued by Jane Harman on April 9, 2002, honoring the career of former Torrance Mayor Dee Hardison: Jane Harman writes: **"I have always treasured Dee's advice, passion, dedication and, most importantly, her hands-on approach."**

Former Mayor Dee Hardison addressed City Council at the last meeting regarding Torrance Municipal Code, Section 61.6.4 ("The 72 Hour Law") which reads as follows:

> SECTION 61.6.4. PARKING VEHICLES IN EXCESS OF SEVENTY-TWO (72) HOURS.
>
> (Amended by 3226)
> No person shall park or leave standing, or cause to have parked or left standing, **any vehicle** on any street in the City for seventy-two (72) or more consecutive hours. This provision shall not be construed to authorize parking in excess of the regulatory time period otherwise provided in this Chapter and all amendments thereto. (Emphasis added.)

Former Mayor Hardison further clarified what she felt was the City's intent for which this ordinance was created. This intent was to eliminate inoperable and abandoned vehicles from public City streets. This Code was not written to govern fully operable, lawfully owned/registered, and regularly used recreational vehicles. **If this law is interpreted as intended and is implemented fairly, then the City of Torrance would have to mark, cite and/or tow every vehicle, every three days.**

OUR PARTICULAR FAMILY USES OUR RV ALMOST EVERY WEEKEND. WE PARK IT IN FRONT OF OUR HOME, NO ONE ELSE'S. ON MONDAY I DUTIFULLY CLEAN IT AND REMOVE

ITEMS. ON THURSDAY AND FRIDAY, I PREPARE IT AND PACK IT FOR THE NEXT WEEKEND. WE MOVE IT IN THE MIDDLE OF THE WEEK TO ADHERE TO THE CURRENT 72-HOUR LAW. WE ARE COMMITTING NO WRONGDOING.

* * * * *

In addition, I conducted some research as to the Torrance City Code regarding RV storage in general. I was able to extract the following from the City of Torrance website. It states as follows:

> SECTION 92.5.13. PARKING ON RESIDENTIALLY ZONED PROPERTY.
>
> (Added by O-3153)
> a) No person shall park or store or let stand **any vehicle** on the front yard of any residentially zoned property **other than on a paved driveway or paved parking area with entrances and exits to the street.**
> b) For purposes of this section, "**vehicle" means any automobile, truck, boat or any device, operable or inoperable with or without wheels, by which any person or property may be propelled, moved or drawn upon any street or highway**.

By stating that "any vehicle" (as defined above) **may not be parked on one's own front yard but rather "on a paved driveway or parking area**… ," the City of Torrance legally allows the right of a homeowner to store their "vehicle" in their own driveway or other paved parking area, be it the street in front of one's own home as it may.

AS HOMEOWNERS AND TAXPAYERS, IT IS OUR LEGAL RIGHT TO REGULARLY USE AND STORE OUR RECREATIONAL VEHICLES ON OUR OWN PROPERTY OR IN FRONT OF OUR OWN HOMES. THIS RIGHT CANNOT FAIRLY BE STRIPPED OF US BECAUSE OF THE BULLYING CLOUT OF THE ANTI-RV ACTIVISTS.

THE LAW AS IT IS STATED SHOULD REMAIN AND/OR IT SHOULD BE AMENDED TO REFLECT WITH SPECIFICITY THE

RIGHT TO PARK ONE'S RV ON ONE'S OWN PROPERTY OR IN FRONT OF ONE'S OWN HOME.

Attached hereto are copies of memoranda and emails, as well as the most recent letter to the editor of the Daily Breeze Newspaper, by a Mr. Jim Harrigan, a member of the Hillside Residents Association (HRA).

While it would take too much time this evening to respond point by point to each item contained in these documents, I would like to request that they be read thoroughly so that the City may form its own opinions as to the underlying tones of this issue. This is clearly an issue of aesthetics and personal taste, nothing more.

As I sadly pondered this issue today, I took special care to glance around our neighborhood at the different homes, yards and driveways...this coveted neighborhood with property values in such desperate need of protection by people like Jim Harrigan and his HRA, who by the way doesn't even live on our street, I glanced around at our neighbors' homes and although I never really paid too much attention to things of this nature before,

-one of them uses a permanent chain link fence in their front yard
-one of them refuses to use curtains on their windows so that they can monitor the cul de saq, and you can see from the street piles of cardboard boxes and unused material THROUGH THE GARAGE WINDOW.
-one of them has an old asphalt driveway with cracks and holes in it
-one of them refuses to rid their front yard of rubbish and vegetation
-down the hill, heck, there's a vintage John Deere tractor in someone's driveway.
AND SO ON, AND SO ON, AND SO ON... .

Mr. Harrigan, why don't you add these things to your crusade? These things that I call being human.

While I agree with Mr. Harrigan whole heartedly, that RV's are not generally aesthetically pleasing, they serve a very important purpose:

> **The purpose of fostering family unity and positive child rearing,**

the very thing this City is known for. Please, I respectfully beg of you to exercise utmost fairness. The RV's should stay.

Thank you.

Yahoo! My Yahoo! Mail Make Yahoo! your home page

YAHOO! MAIL Welcome, **j_peeraer6** [Sign Out, My Account]

Search the Web Search

Mail Home - Mail Tutorials - Help

click here

Mail Addresses Calendar Notepad What's New - Mail For Mobile - Upgrades - Options

Check Mail Compose Search Mail Search the Web

Folders [Add - Edit]

Inbox
Draft
Sent
Bulk [Empty]
Trash [Empty]

My Folders [Hide]

domingo
gifts

What's your Credit Score?

Find old High School friends

Online Degree Programs

Divorced? You can get a M/C

This message is not flagged. [Flag Message - Mark as Unread] Printable View

Date: Thu, 23 Mar 2006 17:27:29 -0800 (PST)

From: "Joy Peeraer" <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com> Add to Address Book Add Mobile Alert

Subject: Letter dated March 15, 2006 Regarding "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on Our Street"

To: dwalker@torrnet.com

CC: "r guyton" <rguyton@torrnet.com>, "mh mauno" <mhmauno@torrnet.com>, "p mcintyre" <pmcintyre@torrnet.com>, "pm nowatka" <pmnowatka@torrnet.com>, "f scotto" <fscotto@torrnet.com>, "cd traffic" <cddtraffic@torrnet.com>, "h witkowsky" <hwitkowsky@torrnet.com>

To The Honorable Mayor Dan Walker and Councilmembers:

As resident and family member of the owner of **4814 Via El Sereno**, the property being attacked for the ownership and storage of a Recreational Vehicle, I am writing on behalf of our family and perhaps the families of other RV owners to address my concerns regarding a memo which was graciously provided to us by one of the neighbors on our street who emphathizes with us regarding the vicious battle which we currently face. Not all of the residents on our street have such aggressive views regarding this issue. As a matter of fact, they are only a very loud few. **(Attached hereto is a copy of the above-referenced memorandum dated March 15, 2006.)**

That having been said, I will respond to the memo by paragraph so as to facilitate the true undertanding of each issue:

See Memo, Paragraph 3: The memo states concerns regarding property values and the recent sale of 4816 Via El Sereno, however, the memo conveniently omits a very important detail, the **reason** why the home was put on the market in the first place.

The owners at 4806 Via El Sereno have spoken with us at length regarding the sale of their home and have indicated that among the many reasons for the sale of their home, one of them is NOT our family...**(NOT OUR RV, NOR OUR ATV's)** nor our "trendy" lifestyle but rather the hostility and animosity which they have been the victims of by a select few neighbors who have made it their job in life to try to inappropriately micro-manage the neighborhood. The same leaders of this war against us.

They indicated that they were concerned for the future of their daughters in a neighborhood lacking neighborly love. These owners were even the victims of a vandalous act wherein the children of one of the militant neighbors placed offensive material on their front doorstep and, when questioned, **tried to blame the incident on OUR CHILDREN** since (given the size and circumstances of our family) they would seem the most likely suspects,

only later to find out the actual truth of the matter.

They further indicated that they would write a letter on our behalf and expressed only their utmost support for our RVing/ATVing lifestyle.

Furthermore, the **5** (NOT 6) All Terrain Vehicles, each owned outright by the owner of 4814 Via El Sereno and cumulatively valued in excess of at $40,000, are **NOT stored..."in [our] front yard"** but rather **ARE IN FACT STORED INSIDE THE RV** or our **GARAGE**. This statement, as well as others, is a blatantly untrue and self-serving statement made with injurious intent. There is nothing in or around our property which would be considered in violation of ANY Torrance City Code.

See Memo, Paragraph 5: "We feel that this is a residential neighborhood and all RVs and **commercial trucks** (with the exception of pick-ups) should be parked in an appropriate industrial storage facility, out of sight to neighbors..." (Emphasis added.)

This raises a very good question as to the many LARGE trucks and extra vehicles regularly parked in the residents' driveways and on our street for days and weeks at a time while they are doing home improvements, i.e. new roofs, tree trimming, interior reconstruction or refuse disposal. Again, this paragraph is worded in a self-serving manner because every one of us has had home improvement done, some of us recently, thereby causing visibility of large "commercial trucks" or refuse bins for several days at a time in excess of 3 days.

Also, let me mention that one of the neighbors who recently spoke at the last City Council meeting (aggressively against parking our RV in front of our home) actually had an out of town family member with an RV parked in front of their home (jutting into the cul de saq, and perpendicular to the street I might add) for I believe an excess of 3 days, causing a similar eyesore, the same eyesore we are being accused of.

See Memo Paragraph 6: "As we are tired of playing games, we now request that all residents call the City Parking [E]nforcement" at 310-618-2344 every 3 days..."

We too are tired of playing games. By this statement, the author of this memo is making an attempt to rally homeowners to harass us pending the outcome of the City's decision...."to call and keep calling..." "Squeaky wheels that vote are noticed by all politicians. Please discipline yourself to call these two numbers IMMEDIATELY AND OFTEN." (Emphasis added.)

It is incomprehensible how you, Honorable Dan Walker, as ultimately fair as you are and it appears a very kind man indeed, could find this persistent harassment of the privileged minority anything but just that. This is a war between Daniel and Goliath and we are being unfairly bullied pending this decision. It is the responsibility of the City to cite us as necessary, not this group of militant homeowners.

See Memo Paragraph 7: "these boorish neighbors..." "trendy selfishness because they can afford it." This is character degradation at its best. By the use of these words, the basis for their argument has undertones of a very personal nature which should NOT be the basis for any legal decisions made regarding this issue. Furthermore, we take great offense to these words as they, by definition, attempt to suggest perhaps a lower level of civil refinement because of our lifestyle.

"Thank you for keeping our neighborhood clean, attractive and expensive."
I am appalled at the arrogance of this sentence. This neighborhood wasn"t always known for its "expensive" qualities but rather a beautiful community in which a family could be raised happily. AN RV FOSTERS FAMILY UNITY. Why should the people with families who still live here (and have lived here since the home was built over 45 years ago) be bullied by newcomers or those with moral characters reflective of a community of exorbitant property values and money arrogance. Hardly fair. Highly discriminatory.

I respectfully request that this issue be treated with the utmost of fairness to **all** concerned, not just the very vocal and aggressively harrassing anti-RV homeowners.

Kind personal regards,

Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

Blab-away for as little as 1¢/min. Make PC-to-Phone Calls using Yahoo! Messenger with Voice.

Attachments Attachment scanning provided by:

Photos:

Save to Computer
Save to Yahoo! Photos

scan0001.jpg(1.3MB) [View]

Save All to Yahoo! Photos

Delete | **Reply** | **Forward** | **Move...**

Previous | Next | Back to Messages Save Message Text | Full Headers

Check Mail | **Compose** **Search Mail** | **Search the Web**

Copyright © 1994-2006 Yahoo! Inc. All rights reserved. Terms of Service - Copyright/IP Policy - Guidelines - Ad Feedback
NOTICE: We collect personal information on this site.
To learn more about how we use your information, see our Privacy Policy

March 15, 2006

To: Via El Sereno Neighbor

Re: **Another** Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located On Our Street

---

#1 Thank you all for your efforts - including the motorhome owner at 4918 Via El Sereno - that resulted in the removal of that RV from our neighborhood.

#2 As you are no doubt aware, we have another RV problem east of us at **4814 Via El Sereno,** across Calle De Arboles.

#3 **This embarrassingly large recreational vehicle/trailer is lowering all of our property values (a discussion with the Realtors of the home for sale at 4806 Via El Sereno have confirmed that potential buyers have questioned and registered concern about the street/driveway storage and presence of this eyesore...and the six, noisy, neighborhood inappropriate ATVs being stored in their front yard. 4806 has been on the market for many months).**

#4 * The problem, according to the parking enforcement people is that this RV owner religiously moves their expensive hobby 6-inches every three days, avoiding ticketing, and, more of a concern, that the current traffic commission of the City has recently recommended to the City Council that the Council allow the unfettered storage of these vehicles in our neighborhoods.

#5 As a fellow homeowner, we need your help. We feel that this is a residential neighborhood and all RVs and commercial trucks (with the exception of pick-ups) should be parked in an appropriate, industrial storage facility, out of sight to our neighbors, friends, guests and/or future prospective buyers of our homes (with the exception of a permitted 24 hour loading/unloading period).

#6 As we are tired of playing games, we now request that all residents call the **City parking enforcement at 310-618-2344** every 3 days to: 1) Report that this over-sized vehicle has not moved since you called three days previously, and: 2) To call and keep calling to complain to the one person that has gone on record approving the traffic commission's recommendation to keep these RVs free to park on our residential streets: your mayor**, Dan Walker at 310-328-5310.** Squeaky wheels that vote are noticed by all politicians. Please discipline yourself to call these two numbers *immediately and often*.

#7 For the good of the neighborhood (**and our property values**), it is time to stop these boorish neighbors who must believe that they are entitled to their trendy selfishness because they can afford it. Thank you for helping to keep our neighborhood clean, attractive and expensive.

#8 **P.S.** There is a new activist, counter organization to the *laissez faire*, "fight-your-own-battles" Riviera Homeowners Association. It is the Hillside Residents Association (HRA) that is currently fighting this RV battle, as well as other neighborhood issues (e.g., ignored traffic laws, ignored building code and encroachment violations, etc.) that have been "winked at" by the City for years. For information and/or free sign-up to join the HRA contact *jh@econdevsys.com*. There is strength in numbers. The City needs to hear our collective, voting voice.

YAHOO! MAIL

Print - Close Window

Date: Thu, 23 Mar 2006 20:34:16 -0800 (PST)

From: "Joy Peeraer" <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>

Subject: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"

To: jh@econdevsys.com

CC: "r guyton" <rguyton@torrnet.com>, "mh mauno" <mhmauno@torrnet.com>, "p mcintyre" <pmcintyre@torrnet.com>, "pm nowatka" <pmnowatka@torrnet.com>, "f scotto" <fscotto@torrnet.com>, "cd traffic" <cddtraffic@torrnet.com>, "d walker" <dwalker@torrnet.com>, "h witkowsky" <hwitkowsky@torrnet.com>

Hillside Residents Association (HRA)

To Whom it May Concern:

I am in receipt of a memorandum dated March 15, 2006 which is entitled as referenced above. However, I was not the intended recipient as I reside at
4814 Via El Sereno, the property address at issue with regard to the ownership and storage of our RV in our driveway or on the street in front of our home.

I promptly took it upon myself to respond to this anger driven memo directly to The Honorable Dan Walker and His Councilmembers. A copy of which you may have the opportunity to review at some point in the future.

I find it very comedic that you repeatedly refer to Via El Sereno as "[Your] Steet" considering that: 1) Our particular home was originally purchased by the Sawers Family and is still owned by the Sawers Family, Second and Third Generations. Needless to say, we will NEVER sell so it is indeed OUR street too; 2) A large number of you who claim that the ownership and storage of our RV affects your property values are merely newcomers, as compared to the 45+ years that this home has been in our family; and lastly; 3) Many of the homeowners on the "lower end" of Via El Sereno only have the luxury of even owning a home there because of the self-less original homeowners who signed an agreement in support of/not opposing their construction tens of years ago. Sad thing is,
you would not find that type of human regard now. Not here. Not on this street.

I am not going to trouble myself with writing a lengthy memo as to why I feel the memo secretly sent to every homeowner on Via El Sereno, except us, should be brought to the attention of the appropriate persons.

What I will say is that we feel that it is our legal right to store our RV on our property, be it in the driveway or on the street in front of our property.

Our right should not be taken away because of the current property values, realizing that the alleged safety issue is clearly a mute point. The fact that the type of people, who purchase homes at the current prices, do not live outside the box, cannot fairly dictate law.

That having been said, we will vehemently oppose your efforts to take away said right.

Cordially,
Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

Blab-away for as little as 1¢/min. Make PC-to-Phone Calls using Yahoo! Messenger with Voice.

YAHOO! MAIL

Print - Close Window

Date: Fri, 24 Mar 2006 06:42:33 -0800 (PST)

From: "Joy Peeraer" <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>

Subject: Correction to prior email: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street

To: jh@econdevsys.com

CC: "r guyton" <rguyton@torrnet.com>, "mh mauno" <mhmauno@torrnet.com>, "p mcintyre" <pmcintyre@torrnet.com>, "pm nowatka" <pmnowatka@torrnet.com>, "f scotto" <fscotto@torrnet.com>, "cd traffic" <cddtraffic@torrnet.com>, "d walker" <dwalker@torrnet.com>, "h witkowsky" <hwitkowsky@torrnet.com>

Hillside Residents Association (HRA)

As I reviewed my email to you regarding the above, it occurred to me that I used the word "mute" incorrectly...I got a chuckle when I re-read it as silly as the mistake is.

Anyway, the word "moot" was intended as it relates to alleged safety issues concerning our RV. The street on which we live is a wide street with ample visibility, not the narrow streets of Old Torrance or the like. There is minimal traffic as it is a partial cul de saq and most obey the speed laws. Our RV does not cause any visual disturbances affecting the safety of our children. Period. Any visual disturbance caused by our RV is only a matter of personal taste of a very loud few.

Furthermore, the safety issues as they relate to this neighborhood are merely used as fuel for the fire, given that there are no safety issues even referenced in your most recent memo.

I apologize for any misunderstanding this slight typographical error may have caused, but I'm sure you understood the intended point upon reading it. It was late and I was very tired, especially tired of having to defend what I feel is our legal right.

Lastly, we do not take kindly to your bullying tactics, i.e. your request stated in your memo that all neighbors harass us every three days through complaints to the City, nor do we receive well the use of degrading words, i.e. "boorish neighbors," etc. To your discredit, it only brings to light the true underlying basis for your argument, which I'm absolutely sure Honorable Dan Walker and his Councilmembers will take into consideration being the fair leaders that they are.

Very truly yours,
Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

Blab-away for as little as 1¢/min. Make PC-to-Phone Calls using Yahoo! Messenger with Voice.

YAHOO! MAIL

Print - Close Window

Date: Fri, 24 Mar 2006 08:21:47 -0800

Subject: Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"

From: "Jim Harrigan" <jh@econdevsys.com>

To: "Joy Peeraer" <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>

Thank you for your explanation for the reasons on why you've stored your trailer in front of your house for the last three years. You've proved the El Sereno letter writer right. You truly come off as a selfish boor that is only thinking of yourself. Congratulations.

Jim Harrigan
Hillside Residents Association

Print - Close Window

Date: Fri, 24 Mar 2006 09:52:53 -0800 (PST)

From: "Joy Peeraer" <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"

To: "Jim Harrigan" <jh@econdevsys.com>

CC: "r guyton" <rguyton@torrnet.com>, "mh mauno" <mhmauno@torrnet.com>, "p mcintyre" <pmcintyre@torrnet.com>, "pm nowatka" <pmnowatka@torrnet.com>, "f scotto" <fscotto@torrnet.com>, "cd traffic" <cddtraffic@torrnet.com>, "d walker" <dwalker@torrnet.com>, "h witkowsky" <hwitkowsky@torrnet.com>

Dear Mr. Harrigan:

Please note that we purchased our 2006 RV in June of 2005, therefore we have only stored it in front of our home for approximately **9 months**. DMV records can prove that.

Where you get "the last three years" is just further evidence of your ignorance of this situation and the author's willingness to blatantly lie to the neighbors AND the City in the many attempts for personal gain. How boorish is that?

Furthermore, by and through the author's public memos to all of our neighbors and your email correspondence with me, you attempt to defame our family and the author is requesting that other neighbors engage in your campaign of harassment against us, the City and especially against Mayor Dan Walker himself by requesting that they call him "immediately and often." Squeaky wheels may be heard, it is true. Bullies are seen as just that.

Please refrain from this harassment or I will seek legal counsel to take all appropriate remedies against you, the author of the memos, and your association until the decision on this matter is made. At which time, I will lawfully abide by the City's decision, whatever that may be.

I am forwarding a copy of this email to Honorable Dan Walker and the Councilmembers so that they can witness first hand your unprofessional and inappropriate conduct regarding this issue.

You may wish to re-think who is truly being boorish in this situation. Our family is merely exercising our right to be heard regarding our views on the matter. If this is considered boorish, then perhaps you and your association may wish to lobby our lawmakers to completely re-write the Constitution.

Best personal regards to you, your family and the association.
It is our wish for a peaceful resolution of this matter.

Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

YAHOO! MAIL

Print - Close Window

Date: Fri, 24 Mar 2006 11:14:40 -0800

Subject: Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"

From: "Jim Harrigan" <jh@econdevsys.com>

To: "Joy Peeraer" <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>

CC: "Rod Guyton" <rguyton@torrnet.com>, "Michael Mauno" <mhmauno@torrnet.com>, "Pat McIntyre" <pmcintyre@torrnet.com>, "Paul Nowatka" <pmnowatka@torrnet.com>, "Scotto, Frank" <fscotto@torrnet.com>, "cd traffic" <cddtraffic@torrnet.com>, "Dan Walker" <dwalker@torrnet.com>, "Hope Witkowsky" <hwitkowsky@torrnet.com>

It's interesting to note that you've "only" stored your RV in front of your house for the last 10 months. Have you ever given consideration to storing it in a storage yard...out of a residential neighborhood?

YAHOO! MAIL

Print - Close Window

Date: Fri, 24 Mar 2006 11:34:25 -0800 (PST)

From: "Joy Peeraer" <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"

To: "Jim Harrigan" <jh@econdevsys.com>

CC: "r guyton" <rguyton@torrnet.com>, "mh mauno" <mhmauno@torrnet.com>, "p mcintyre" <pmcintyre@torrnet.com>, "pm nowatka" <pmnowatka@torrnet.com>, "r scotto" <rscotto@torrnet.com>, "ed traffic" <edtraffic@torrnet.com>, "d walker" <dwalker@torrnet.com>, "h witkowsky" <hwitkowsky@torrnet.com>

Dear Mr. Harrigan:

Yes, we have given it thought. We have put it in our driveway to please the neighbors too, damaging the new $13,000 driveway I might add. That wasn't enough. We also offered to move it to a storage facility if the neighbors wanted to collectively pay the monthly fee.

However, due to the amount of use our RV gets because of our daughters' racing schedule, just about every weekend, we have changed our opinion on that matter and we feel it is our right to store it on front of our home. Period.

Again, we wish no ill feelings and wish a peaceful resolution of this matter. However, as I stated before, we will not be bullied by you or anyone else.

We will fight to oppose your efforts to the very last hour.

Please be advised that this and all further communications, in the form of emails or memoranda, will be copied directly the Mayor Dan Walker and the Councilmembers.

Kindest personal regards,

Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

YAHOO! MAIL

Print - Close Window

Date: Fri, 24 Mar 2006 13:11:18 -0800

Subject: Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"

From: "Jim Harrigan" <jh@econdevsys.com>

To: "Joy Peeraer" <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>

Game on

YAHOO! MAIL

Print - Close Window

Date: Fri, 24 Mar 2006 13:43:29 -0800 (PST)

From: "Joy Peeraer" <j_peeraer6@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: "Another Obnoxious Recreational Vehicle Located on [OUR] Street"

To: "Jim Harrigan" <jh@econdevsys.com>

CC: "r guyton" <rguyton@torrnet.com>, "mh mauno" <mhmauno@torrnet.com>, "p mcintyre" <pmcintyre@torrnet.com>, "pm nowatka" <pmnowatka@torrnet.com>, "r scotto" <rscotto@torrnet.com>, "cd traffic" <cddtraffic@torrnet.com>, "d walker" <dwalker@torrnet.com>, "n witkowsky" <hwitkowsky@torrnet.com>

Dear Mr. Harrigan:

I'm sorry that you see this as a "game." Should you truly see it that way, please, for the sake of all concerned, keep this civil and legal.

Yours cordially

Resident, 4814 Via El Sereno

Letters to the Editor

RV ordinance must include permits

Much has been made recently over the role of the Torrance City Council in the problem of recreational vehicle parking on city streets and the storage of RVs in driveways, side yards and front lawns.

As a 20-year registered Libertarian, I am concerned about having any government entity involved in personal or "common-good" decisions that could/should be handled by individual or collective action/choice. Unfortunately, the continuing and multiplying blight of RVs in Torrance residential neighborhoods, perpetuated and obnoxiously condoned by a selfish minority, is not something that can be solved by nongovernmental intervention.

That stated, the Hillside Residents Association believes that the only practical decision is to limit all RVs to daytime parking only, with all RV parking prohibited overnight on all city streets -- or limiting all RVs on residential streets to a 24-hour "permitted" time limit. Why? Because 24 hours is more than enough to load and/or unload a motorhome/trailer/boat/ATV. I rent an RV at least once a year. When you're paying by the day and attempting to get out of town before afternoon traffic, following the designated 10 a.m. pick-up, you can prepare/load a 36-foot motor home for a two-week trip in three to four hours.

Whatever the time limit, it must be "permitted" because, in the real world, if the time limit is not "permitted," the RV owner will:

• Use the maximum allowed time limit to park his RV in front of his home or a neighbor's home.

• Wait until a neighbor calls parking enforcement to complain that the maximum time limit has expired.

Parking enforcement will come out, eventually, to mark the tires and then will wait the designated time limit to return (maybe) to check to see if the RV has been moved. If it hasn't been moved, it might be ticketed, but we're already at six to 14 days minimum after the initial parking -- and counting

• If it has been moved a minimum of 6 inches -- and what RV owner doesn't fully understand how to circumvent the designated time limit? -- then the process needs to be repeated to no avail, over and over and over again, leading to our current, frustrating, untenable situation in our residential neighborhoods.

With a "permitted" time limit, the RV owner has no "wiggle-room" and can be/should be ticketed (or towed) after the first complaint.

The HRA opposes the parking/storage of any RV, whatever the size (or any commercial vehicle, except pickup trucks) on residential driveways, back and side yards and front lawns. We see no difference between parking/storage on public streets or moving the same eyesore 10 feet to private property. A pig is a pig is a pig.

-- **JIM HARRIGAN**